

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL. IV

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 22, 1910

No. 4

Teachers of the Classics who have been for years striving by means of their work to develop the minds of the students under their influence and instill into them habits of exact and continuous study have understood fully the fallacy of the elective system and the immeasurable damage done to the cause of pure culture by the work of ex-President Eliot of Harvard University. Since Professor Lowell has been attempting to remedy in part the mischief done by Harvard's forty years of perversity, we teachers of the Classics have not solaced ourselves with the time-honored 'I told you so', but have rather looked seriously to the future with the hope that, after all, the pendulum had not swung too far in the wrong direction. This sentiment is well voiced by Professor J. Irving Manatt of Brown University, who, in an article in the May number of *The American College*, addresses a plea to the students of Brown University for the conservation of the Classics. Leaving out the sentences of rather far-fetched humor with which Professor Manatt enlivens his words, I quote the following:

Every educated man is, willy nilly, a trustee of the world's accumulated culture. If this treasure of the race be bartered for a mess of pottage, every man in this company must share the responsibility; and I pray you not to shirk it. Here, elsewhere, we want directors who direct; watchmen who keep awake. You know as well as I do how the intellectual and spiritual climate has changed in our time; how our seats of learning have become seats of everything but learning; how (as President Lowell puts it) "Athletics has beaten scholarship out of sight". President Eliot began his long administration by claiming for the Harvard degree "nothing less than four years devoted to liberal culture"; he closed it as the advocate of a three years' course which might include such broad and liberal studies as coal mining, ore dressing, foundry practice and blacksmithing! Specialization making sharp men and dissipation making shallow ones had run full course not at Harvard only, but in the college world at large; and it was high time for Mr. Lowell's new policy—"to develop the best all-round men in the United States". He has begun well by scotching the hydra that beset the springs—the myriad-headed monstrosity dubbed free election which really spells free damnation. But it remains to be seen whether even a Harvard president can graft a backbone into a jellyfish; whether anything short of knife and cautery can save the game.

Right here at the turn of the road is the real educator's opportunity and obligation. We want a

reevaluation of studies in a larger view of the end of all study, which is the making of all-round men. And we need not be surprised if it be found that these man-making studies are, in the main, just the good old humanities, with their source and centre in Greek, but radiating out (as all Greek things do) into manifold developments of sweetness and light and power. The last man you would take for a *laudator temporis acti* is our own Andrews; and he declares that "no modern community can, as a community, dispense with Greek studies except as it elects to be barbaric". That is a judgment worth weighing and history sustains it. We cannot with impunity drop Greek out of our national culture. That has been done more than once in history and always with disastrous consequences.

The plea has been made so often that its iteration sometimes seems to be wearisome and, as far as Greek is concerned, I very much fear that Greek has been dropped out of our national culture. Fortunately the power of Greek culture does not depend entirely upon the persistence of Greek studies. The torch of learning was carried through the revival of learning without any serious knowledge of Greek. The previous centuries of education, whatever education was, were largely Greek in foundation but Greek through Latin forms and the advocates of classical culture need not despair completely because Greek has vanished from the preparatory school. If the teachers of Latin do their duty, Greek influence will not have vanished and meanwhile there will be the chosen few who have continued to draw their inspiration immediately from the fountains. I do not mean that Latin is a form of Greek culture. Some teachers of Greek have been inclined to scorn Latin on this ground but, whatever may be said to the contrary, Greek has been preserved to the modern world by means of Latin and the spirit of Greek need not fail so long as Latin remains vigorous. If, therefore, the teachers of Greek are alive to the situation, they will champion the cause of Latin and strengthen it wherever they can, for he that helps the cause of Latin aids the persistence of Greek influence.

G. L.

## THE PRESENT STATUS OF LATIN TEXT CRITICISM

Criticism of the text of an author, ancient or modern, is of course the first step that scholars must take before they can begin their detailed study

of the text for the purpose of historical or literary interpretation or comparison with other authors in respect to style, vocabulary, syntax, or for any other of the manifold purposes for which a work is approached. When we remember that the use of a text for any scholarly purpose whatsoever presupposes that it is, to the last letter, in the exact form in which the creator of it intended it to be, we realize at once the absolute necessity for accurate textual criticism. This, of course, does not mean that the world of scholarship must stand still until the textual critic has entirely finished his work, any more than it means that the textual critic must suspend his labors until he has the use of all the valuable MSS now buried under Herculaneum. It does mean that his importance should be recognized.

No doubt you grant all this and wonder why I should take up your time to tell it to you; I simply wish to call it to your attention in order to prepare for my coming remarks.

As far as the classical Latin authors are concerned the subject of textual criticism itself is subdivided into several fields. If we had left to us in legible writing the original MSS of the authors, and if these MSS had never been changed by hands other than those which first wrote them, and if we were absolutely certain of these points, then the problems of textual criticism would not be. The careful preparation of the printer's copy from the MSS would be the only task of the textual critic. Would that it were so! Under existing conditions the first step is to examine such MSS as remain, and to decide which is, or are, the best of any given work. When we have gleaned all that we can from the MSS we are ready to resort to emendation. Now there are many different kinds of emendation, as many as there are different kinds of men—the emendations of inspiration, the emendations reached by logical deduction, and the emendations that do not emend. Some men are born emenders, others make themselves emenders—while the rest of us have emendations thrust upon us. Not that I do not believe in emendation, but I do believe that much of it is unnecessary and easily avoidable.

My point then is merely to urge the importance of MS study. It is to this branch of textual criticism that I shall mainly devote myself in this paper.

Let me say at once that this work is important not merely to some but to all; not solely to the college professor, but also to the secondary school teacher. Lack of time forbids detailed examples to substantiate my statements; suffice it to say for the benefit of the high school teacher that the text of many of Cicero's Orations is being considerably altered by recent work in textual criticism.

There are some people who believe that all that

can be done with the MSS has been done and that, therefore, they are justified in resorting to emendation. Nothing can be farther from the truth, and I trust that I shall make clear to you the absurdity of such a view. Others believe that the MS problem is insoluble and that for this reason they may disregard it and resort to emendation. Perhaps parts of the problem *are* insoluble, and certainly many parts of it are extremely difficult, but if we grant the great importance of it, as I think we must, then it should not be abandoned until extraordinary efforts have been made to solve it. Others, again, believe that the results of such study are not of importance commensurate with the time that is spent on it. These are the hardest to reckon with and some of them cannot be convinced. But surely even the smallest contribution to our knowledge of what the ancient authors really wrote is worth a large expenditure of time and effort. Merely to prove that a text that is generally accepted is based on good MS support is, in my estimation, a valuable contribution.

After this long and top-heavy introduction I can approach my subject. We are told that the present does not really exist—that it is merely a point from which one views the past and the future. And so in discussing the present status of Latin textual criticism we must perforce take a glimpse at the past and consider the outlook for the future. My outline of the history of the subject pretends to be nothing more than a slight sketch, and one, moreover, which does not take all factors into account.

The ancients themselves indulged in textual criticism, especially in emendation. The habit of emending continued through the Middle Ages and during the Renaissance flourished to an unprecedented degree. The Italian Humanists were so thoroughly immersed in Latin that their emendations were often highly successful. They, moreover, realized that the older a MS was the more valuable it was likely to be, but they were not expert enough to date MSS with any degree of definiteness, and besides, when given MSS of about equal age, either could not, or would not, distinguish the better from the worse. The MSS of the 15th century are, more than those of any other period, editions containing variants from other MSS, good or bad, and emendations of Renaissance scholars or would-be scholars. The most thoroughly 'corrected' MS was the one most eagerly sought for copying purposes. The introduction of printing brought no immediate change, inasmuch as highly 'corrected' MSS were often chosen as a basis for the texts of the first printed editions. Commentaries, critical and hermeneutic, had existed even in the MSS, and were retained in the printed editions. Gradually the critical notes became more ample, the references to MSS more definite. But the choice of MSS by editors

of the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries was quite haphazard, complete collations were not given, the relations of MSS to each other were not studied, and carelessness characterized the whole. I have elsewhere shown that these statements are true even of one of the most reliable of these early editors<sup>1</sup>. The work of others has proved that the references to MSS of Scaliger, Bosius, Cruquius, Barth and a host of others are full of fraud or carelessness, or both. I would suggest a canon of criticism that ought to be adopted by all textual critics: A scholar of the period between the 15th and 18th centuries who quotes readings from MSS is guilty of fraud or gross carelessness until he is proved innocent. If this principle were rigorously adhered to, it would be a great step in advance. The strangle hold which Cruquius had on the textual criticism of Horace has only recently been loosened.

Just as the motion of the waves is only apparently a forward movement of the water, so in these centuries there was an activity in the stormy sea of textual criticism that seemed to be progress, but was not. More and more MSS were consulted and quoted, and no edition was complete without new readings drawn from all sorts of MSS. The climax came toward the end of the 18th century. I will mention a typical example. Laurens van Santen was one of the last of the many scholars of this period who made Holland famous for its classical learning. He was particularly interested in the poems of Catullus, Propertius and Tibullus. He completed Burmann's edition of Propertius, left incomplete by Burmann's death, and published as a 'specimen' the 68th poem of Catullus, the Manlius elegy, intending to publish later a complete edition of Catullus. He gives us two reasons for his specimen edition: first, that he may have the benefit of the judgment and criticism of scholars, and second, that he may collect from all quarters ("undique") more material for establishing the correct text and that he may invite all to impart to him such material as they may have an opportunity of collecting. Santen's library is now in Berlin, and all his collections of material are to be found there. In looking these over one finds collations of MSS in many forms by many men, collations of old editions, collations of editions with old MS notes. Santen tried to get a collation of every existing MS and edition, that he himself did not own, of the three authors mentioned. He spared no expense and he spared not his friends. And how did he make use of all this material? His principle, or lack of principle, was to select the reading that in his judgment and according to his taste was best, no matter what the source. Of course he often noticed that one MS was dependent on another, but that was of no

importance in his eyes. The reading was the thing. Now if Santen's judgment had been infallible and we knew it to be so, this method would be the only proper and easy one. But it was not. We all know that even the greatest scholars disagree on matters of text.

Santen's specimen edition of the 68th poem of Catullus contains 67 quarto pages of text and notes, critical and explanatory. At this rate his complete edition would have filled about 1400 quarto pages without index: interpretative commentary had kept pace with critical commentary. The bulkiest editions of the Latin Classics are those published in the 18th century.

We may readily surmise that it was this cumbersome bulk that brought the reaction which came less than a century ago, and, as a matter of fact, Lachmann tells us in his edition of Tibullus of 1829 that he thought it time to put the small text of Tibullus into one small booklet, instead of into two large volumes as had been the custom. That Lachmann marks an epoch in textual criticism is a commonplace, and, in some respects, is certainly true. He promulgated the principle of selection of MSS, and argued that emendation should not be resorted to unless the selected MSS failed to give intelligible readings. His principle was excellent, and we have learned to take it for granted, but his methods of application were distinctly poor. He chose the most convenient MSS on which to base his texts, and did not think it worth while to go to any great pains to search for unknown MSS. In the one sense, then, in that he gave to the world his policy of selection and introduced the present concise form of textual apparatus, his work marks a distinct advance; in the other sense, in that he had no desire to look far or long for MSS, he kept the critical world at a standstill for many years. For his views, both good and bad, found wide acceptance. Even to this day classical scholarship is deeply infected with Lachmann's indifference and lack of curiosity concerning unreported MSS.

But if Lachmann's influence was widespread, yet it did not stop progress altogether. Here and there a man was found whose curiosity led him to look for new MSS. A typical example is Emil Baehrens. In the 1870's and 1880's he examined a large number of MSS of many Latin authors and discovered some that were extremely important. For example, in the case of Tibullus, he found the only complete MS that antedates the 15th century—and there are several hundred MSS of Tibullus in existence. Nor did he make his finds in obscure or inaccessible libraries. He made them in libraries like the Ambrosian at Milan and the Laurentian at Florence, where they had been readily accessible to any who cared to look. It is almost inconceivable to us that for fifty years after Lachmann had made his pro-

<sup>1</sup>The Identification of the MSS of Catullus Cited in Statius' Edition of 1966 (Chicago, 1968).



nouncement on the selection of MSS, these MSS, easily recognizable as valuable, remained unnoticed. This circumstance is an interesting example to show how Lachmann's indifference to unreported MSS had spread over the learned world.

Baehrens, too, had his faults. He selected some very bad MSS as a basis for his texts, and was, moreover, an extremely careless collator. Yet his work has in several cases been allowed to stand until the present day. His poor MSS have not been rejected and his good MSS have not been recollated—and this in spite of his notorious carelessness, so notorious that even Sandys, in his *History of Classical Scholarship*, a work generally so laudatory, comments on it. Here is an instance. Baehrens discovered F, one of the two complete MSS of Propertius which antedate the 15th century. It is generally recognized as important. In Baehrens' collation of it, which appeared in his edition of Propertius in 1880, there are scores and probably hundreds of mistakes. Yet no new collation has ever been published<sup>1</sup>.

Thus we are brought to our own times. And now I must present to you in brief the thoughts which suggested this paper. First of all, some criticisms must be made. Many editors are still in the thrall of Lachmann. They will not exert themselves in order to find new MS support. Many also are still following in the footsteps of Baehrens and those like him, holding tenaciously to some of the atrocious MSS selected by their predecessors, and making no attempt to correct some of the miserable collations of the good MSS. Baehrens' careless collating was not peculiar to him. Many editors who actually do collate MSS seem to think that inaccuracy is excusable because of haste. They probably never think of the harm that is done in fields of investigation that depend on the text, or else they might have a greater sense of responsibility.

The Teubner series of Latin Classics is in many ways an admirable one. Its cheapness, its neatness, its uniformity of appearance and arrangement, its convenient form, and the names of well-known scholars on its title-pages have served to exalt it to a very high position. But we have, I fear, gone too far and have held it well-nigh perfect. The editions are of uneven merit; a few excellent, some good, and many bad.

National prejudice, which has played an important role in other fields of scholarship, is still a bane in the field of textual criticism. Catullus has been peculiarly unfortunate in this respect. Lachmann chose two Berlin MSS (they were the most convenient, for he lived in Berlin) on which to base his text. Both of these are clearly inferior MSS, but one of them, the Datanus, the Germans are very

reluctant to give up, as there is no other MS of Catullus in Germany that is of any value. It is a very sad state of affairs, for it is to the Germans that we have looked for most of the work in textual criticism, as in other fields of scholarship. The French have a valuable MS of Catullus in the *Germanensis* in Paris. But the way in which French scholars resent the slightest suggestion that this MS is not perfect is amusing as well as sad.

With the introduction of Lachmann's canon of selection of MSS came the troublesome problem of making the correct selection. We have seen that Lachmann's judgment in this respect was often faulty, and that Baehrens' judgment was by no means perfect. The most perplexing problem that has confronted the text critic since Lachmann's day has been the application of his principle. The method in use has been, naturally enough, the comparison of readings. The MS with the better reading is the better MS. But people differ widely in their views of the value of readings. Besides, many really good readings are emendations of early scholars (for the owners of MSS, often being scholars, emended their MSS, and their emendations were copied into other MSS), and mislead us in our endeavor to trace MS tradition. That such emendations found their way into MSS, especially into those of the 15th century, has long been known, but scholars have been very lax in weeding them out. The great difficulty of deciding between MSS on the basis of good or bad readings alone, a difficulty that has been enormously increased by the publication of collations full of errors of omission and commission, is due to the subjective nature of the work. So it has been possible for one man after another to write a doctoral dissertation demolishing his predecessor's work to the satisfaction at least of himself and his professor. Thus it is, too, that so many scholars have become disgusted with the unsubstantial character of the work on MS relationships and have either disregarded it or persistently poked fun at it. Just as the inefficient teacher of Latin—and he is no rarity—has been largely responsible for the attack on Latin, so the careless textual critic has brought his subject into something like disrepute in certain quarters.

The criticisms made thus far might leave one in a very pessimistic state. But there is cause for optimism. There are certain tendencies in the field of textual criticism which promise a bright future.

Even Baehrens had been interested to some extent in the history of the MSS he used. The tendency at present is to give a good deal of attention to this subject, inasmuch as the tracing of the history of a MS may be of considerable help in determining its relations to other MSS. This historical study, or study of external evidence, as it may roughly be described, in distinction from the internal evidence

<sup>1</sup> I may state here that I expect soon to publish a new collation of this MS.

of the text itself, is of especial value because it is objective, rather than subjective. Taken alone, there is not enough of it to settle all our problems, but when used in conjunction with internal evidence, it leads to certain and valuable results.

Let us see what the study of the external evidence involves. It involves the study of mediaeval and Renaissance libraries and of their catalogues. It involves the study of the History of Scholarship throughout the centuries. It involves the study of the History of Latin Literature and Philology during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

As an instance of the results that are gained from a study of library catalogues let me mention merely the important discoveries made by A. C. Clark through an ancient catalogue of MSS regarding the *Vetus Cluniacensis* of Cicero's Orations. In the investigation of the Mediaeval period, the remarkable work of Traube, short-lived as he was, has attracted wide attention, and has left a lasting influence for good. The work is being carried on by his pupils, of whom there is a fair number in the United States. At the forefront of the study of the Italian Renaissance, from the viewpoint of the student of the text-tradition of Latin authors, stands Sabbadini. Many other Italians are busily engaged in the field but very few Americans are actively working in it, extremely important as it is. I would strongly urge that we give more attention to it.

Another encouraging tendency is that scholars are beginning to examine all the existing MSS of the different works. It is highly important that lists be made of the MSS for every work, and that these MSS be carefully examined. The best results will come from complete collations, but in many instances the bulk of the work makes this, for the present at least, impossible. The early editions should be examined just as the MSS are, and the MS notes in early editions should be studied. Finally the critical commentaries of the editors up to the middle of the last century must be investigated and their references to MSS evaluated. And thus the cycle will be complete; again our aim will be to examine all the existing material, just as it was the aim of Santen and his fellows. But the difference in purpose and in method will give far different results.

In conclusion, I would call attention to the opportunity that we Americans have. There is a large amount of work to be done which demands acuteness and patience, qualities that are the property of American scholarship. We are handicapped by our distance from the fields of work. The situation can be partly met by inducing our philanthropists to purchase the few private libraries of Europe which are still purchasable.

Shortly before his death a few years ago Mommsen said to Grenfell: "The nineteenth century was the century of epigraphy, the twentieth will be that

of palaeography". He had reference to the Egyptian finds, and to the prospective finds at Herculaneum—when that site is finally uncovered. To my mind, the twentieth century will be the age of palaeography not only in the sense which Mommsen meant, but also in the much wider sense for which I have just been pleading.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH.

B. L. ULLMAN.

## REVIEWS

In the publication of aids for the classical student the Germans lead the world. At the one extreme we have such monumental productions as the Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyclopädie, Roscher's *Lexicon of Mythology*, Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, Müller's *Handbuch*, at the other books small in price, meant evidently to make in part, at least, a popular appeal, that put before the student a vast amount of material in a form most attractive and helpful, and at the same time make but slight drain upon his pocket-book.

It is of a book which falls within the latter class that I would speak at present. During the summer I noted in the salesrooms of G. E. Stechert and Co. a most attractive book entitled *Kunst und Leben im Altertum*, by Hugo Muzik, a Gymnasial Professor in Vienna, and Franz Perschinka, Landesschulinspektor in Trieste (Wien, Tempsky: Leipzig, Freytag (1900)). The book costs 4.40 Marks. The main part of it consists of 170 pages of photographs, diagrams, restorations, etc., illustrating (1) *Kunstgeschichte*, Topographie, Mythologie, (2) *Kulturgeschichte*. Often there are several cuts on one page; the book thus contains many hundreds of figures. I know of no investment of a dollar which a teacher of the Classics will find more profitable than this book.

It is manifestly impossible to present many details concerning such a volume. The first fifty pages of illustrations deal with art in Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia, Persia and Asia Minor, with art in Greece from the Mycenaean age to the Hellenistic, with art in Italy. The section on topography (51-97) deals with Athens, Greece outside Athens, Sicily, Rome, the Vicinity of Rome, Pompeii, the Apennines and Etruria, and Roman monuments outside Italy. In these pages in particular much that is not accessible to every one has been put together. In the second part, under the head of *Kulturgeschichte* (98-170), we have a great collection of most helpful material on *Öffentliches Leben*, *Gottesdienstliche Altertümer*, *Kriegswesen* (of Greeks, Romans, and Barbarians), *Seewesen*, *das Haus* (Greek and Roman), *Mahlzeiten*, *Hausrat*, *Tracht und Schmuck*, *Hochzeit und Kindererziehung*, *Gymnastik und öffentliche Spiele*, *Theater*, *Ackerbau*, *Handel und Gewerbe*, *Münzen*, *Bestattung*. I can best sum up my impression of the book by saying that

better than anything else I know it will serve as a running commentary, in its illustrations, on a course of study, with or without the living instructor, on Greek and Roman life within the fields which the book touches at all.

No descriptions of the illustrations are to be found in the book. But on pages VI-XVI the sources whence the figures were drawn are carefully given. Where these sources are books, the reader will readily find in those books descriptions of the views. The places where photographs on which certain pictures are based may be purchased are also given. Pages 171-195 contain three indexes, German, Latin, and Greek. C. K.

**The Roman Forum: A Photographic Description of its Monuments.** By Rodolfo Lanciani. With 53 Illustrations and a Map. Rome, Frank and Co.: New York, G. E. Stechert and Co. (1910).

Pages 7-13 constitute a very brief Historical Introduction giving an account all too brief of the history of the Forum, more especially of its destruction. The account is scrappy and does not come very close to the present day. No concerted or coherent account is given, for example, of the brilliant series of discoveries made within the last fifteen years or so. In a word the value of the book does not lie at all in this Introduction or in what is said about the illustrations; it lies in the illustrations themselves.

Of these there are fifty-three, many eight by five inches (or larger) in size; they are all extremely good. The first and the third show reconstructions of the Forum, the second the *Suovetaurilia* animals from the Trajan Reliefs; four to seven show the Forum at various times from 1561 to the end of the eighteenth century; eight and nine give views of the Forum as it stands today. These last named views are very good, particularly number eight. The remaining views picture many of the more important remains in the Forum.

The illustrations are on the odd-numbered pages; opposite each illustration is a brief description of it. There is, finally, a large plan of the Forum as a whole.

The book will be found serviceable as a supplement to such a work as Hülsen's work on the Forum (in either its German or its English dress). Its illustrations are larger and better than those in Hülsen; to mention the letter-press of Lanciani's book, which, by the way, is in English throughout, in the same breath with Hülsen's, would be foolishness indeed. C. K.

**Aristotle's Criticism of Plato.** By J. M. Watson. Oxford: University Press (1909).

This essay has been printed by the friends of the author after his death "in order that some memorial

may remain of a singularly gifted young man to whom they were deeply attached" (Introductory note by Professor Burnet). Mr. Watson in the earlier and larger part of the work discusses the famous sixth chapter of the first book of the *Metaphysics*, the Aristotelian criticism of the Ideas, the doctrine of Ideal Numbers and of Plato's aetiology. He arrives at the conclusion that Aristotle did not misapprehend the Platonic first principles; that he is correct in what he says of the contents of the Ideal world, that in the question of Ideal numbers both Aristotle and Plato are right, though at cross-purposes with each other, and that Aristotle is justified in his account, exaggerated though it is, of the transcendent objectivity of the Platonic Idea and in his severe criticism of the Platonic aetiology. In the later part of his work he takes up Aristotle's criticisms of the science and biology of the *Timaeus*, the criticism in the *Politics* of the Republic, and those in the *Ethics* of Plato's Idea of Good and his doctrine of pleasure.

Mr. Watson defends Aristotle against what he deems the unfairness of the majority of Aristotelian critics, one of whom has recently said that Aristotle was by temperament a church-warden and Plato a Titan! He admits that Aristotle does not show to his best advantage in his criticism of Plato, but feels that it cannot be "proved that Aristotle is guilty toward Plato of any fundamental misrepresentation", and that Plato cannot be said to be fully known until he is re-read in the light of Aristotle.

The problems involved in Aristotle's criticism of Plato are set forth by the author in a lucid and penetrating style and his defense of Aristotle in many points seems adequate. The logic of the following argument however is open to question. "That Aristotle who had the benefit of Plato's own conversation and instruction for twenty years should never once have seen what Plato meant by the transcendence of the Idea and the Particular's participation therein is simply incredible". He goes further with the argument from probability to maintain that Aristotle could not have been a weakling in mathematics since his was the acutest mind of the school and "the very fact of his being a member of the Academy already implies that he could not have neglected the subject". But greatness of mind does not by any means always connote greatness in mathematics. A. E. Taylor has put the case well in the Introduction to his book on Aristotle and his Predecessors, where he says,

Aristotle's unsympathetic account of Pythagoreanism and Platonism is largely explained by the simple consideration that the leading ideas of both those philosophies are essentially mathematical, whereas Aristotle was by training and natural bent a biologist and of a thoroughly non-mathematical cast of mind. His criticism of the mathematical philosophers in books A. M. N. of the *Metaphysics* betrays much the same kind of misunderstanding as we should



expect if a thinker of the antecedents of Herbert Spencer were to set himself to demolish the ideas for instance of Weierstrass or Cantor.

Mr. Watson shows every here and there in his essay a realization of the fact that Aristotle errs because of the concrete character of his own intellect and in his inability to comprehend the poetry and abstract philosophy of Plato's thought. His discussion is vigorous and interesting and Professor Burnet well says of it in the introductory note that even if he has not answered the question with which he deals he has asked it in the right way.

VASSAR COLLEGE.

GRACE HARRIET MACURDY.

Prof. H. C. Butler, who was in charge of the archaeological expedition to the ancient city of Sardis in Asia Minor, has returned to Princeton, reporting satisfactory progress in the work. The excavation was begun at the bank of the River Pactolus. At a depth of twenty-five feet was found a pavement, which proved to be that of the Lydian city. One large building and parts of two others were also discovered, all being of much archaeological importance. A little later large masses of marble were found, which proved to be the substructure of a great temple, the eastern end of which is represented by two huge columns 350 feet away. The temple is in a fairly good state of preservation and one of the largest ever found. Inscriptions established the date of its erection as the fourth century B. C. Fragments of statuary and many gold ornaments of much beauty were unearthed in the Lydian necropolis across the river from the city.

When the work stopped on July 1 the excavations had been carried 280 feet back from the river, but only about one-fifth of the whole temple has been unearthed. Not long afterward Professor Butler and his party started on their return journey to America, leaving the excavations in charge of a guard of Turkish soldiers. The work will be continued next spring.—*The Nation*, October 1, 1910.

### THE NEW STATUE OF AUGUSTUS

Scarcely a year passes without reminding us in the most striking fashion of the fact that the soil of Rome and its vicinity is an inexhaustible storehouse of ancient art. Following close on the now famous Niobide, the *Ἐφεδρισμός*, the Discobolus, the Hermes, the Market Woman and others comes now a full length statue of Augustus, which is regarded by those who have seen it as by far the best portrait of Augustus in sculpture yet discovered. Last June workmen engaged on a private villa on the Via Labicana unearthed the statue, which represents the emperor as Pontifex Maximus fully robed and with covered head. The calm and dignified countenance apparently bearing the signs of recent suffering suggested to both Barnabei and Baccelli that the portrait belongs to the time just after the serious illness mentioned by Suetonius and Pliny. As this occurred in 23 B. C. the theory is not improbable, for the statue clearly portrays the features of a man about forty years of age. This statue has

the rare distinction of being almost perfectly preserved. Not a scratch disfigures the face or head and only the two hands are missing. No other portrait of Augustus has come down to us in such good condition; even the wonderful head of the statue from Prima Porta, now in the Vatican, is somewhat restored. The new work is now in the National Museum (Terme) where it will probably be placed on exhibition as soon as questions of ownership can be settled.<sup>1</sup>

H. L. W.

Readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY who are especially interested in things Roman will be glad to learn that English scholars have organized in London a Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, which will publish a journal, form a library, hold meetings, assist the British School in Rome, and generally promote the better knowledge and understanding of the Roman world. The inaugural meeting of the new society was held on the second of last June.

H. L. W.

### THE NEW YORK LATIN CLUB

The first luncheon will take place on Saturday, November 19, at The Gregorian, at twelve o'clock noon. The address will be delivered by Dr. Herbert W. Smyth, Eliot Professor of Greek in Harvard University; his subject will be *Graecia Capta*. Dr. Smyth is well known to all students of the Classics from his frequent articles in the classical journals, his edition of the Greek Melic Poets, and his great work on the Ionic Dialects. His theme—a peculiarly apposite one at the present time—will be sure of a careful and scholarly treatment.

This year again special rates are offered in the joint interests of The New York Latin Club and The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, as follows: (1) \$2.50, for three luncheons and membership in The New York Latin Club; (2) \$4.00, for three luncheons, membership in both Associations and subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY; (3) \$5.00, to cover (2) and The Classical Journal; (4) \$6.67, to cover (3) and Classical Philology.

Persons desiring to avail themselves of these offers are requested to communicate with Mr. William F. Tibbetts, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn.

### RECENT BOOKS

Apuleius: The Story of Cupid and Psyche. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by L. C. Purser. London: George Bell and Sons (1910). \$1.75.

Einführung in die Altertumswissenschaft. Edited by A. Gercke and E. Norden. Volume II. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner (1910). 35 Marks for the whole. Volume II contains Griechische und römische Privatleben, by Erich Prentice, 1-72; Griechische Kunst, by Franz Winter, 73-190; Griechische und römische Religion, by Sam Wide, 191-290; Geschichte der Philosophie, by A. Gercke, 291-392; Exakte Wissenschaften und Medizin, by J. L. Heiberg, 393-432.

Seneca: Select Letters. Edited by Walter C. Summers. London: The Macmillan Co. (1910). Pp. cxiv+383.

<sup>1</sup>Accounts of the statue may be seen in The New York Sun, Sunday, July 17, and in The Evening Sun for August 1. C. K.

**THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY** is published by the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College, 525 West 120th Street, New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY**), are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia,) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

Outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY** is one dollar per year.

*Editor-in-Chief*

GONZALEZ LODGE, Teachers College, Columbia University

*Associate Editors*

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

ERNEST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

HARRY L. WILSON, Johns Hopkins University

*Business Manager*

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, queries, etc., should be sent to the editor-in-chief. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

**INVESTIGATE the NEW CICERO in the  
LAKE CLASSICAL SERIES by**

Harold Whetstone Johnston, Ph.D., Indiana State University and Hugh McMaster Kingery, Ph.D. Wabash College

**A FITTING COMPANION TO**

JANES AND JENKS' *BELLUM HELVETICUM*  
WALKER'S *CAESAR*

two editions; four book and seven book

KNAPP'S *VERGIL*

The *CICERO* is issued in two editions

Six Orations, letters and Sallust \$2.00

Ten Orations, letters and Sallust \$1.25

with separate class room text

**SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY**

378 Wabash Ave., Chicago

37 East 28th St., New York

**MACMILLAN'S LATIN SERIES**

**CORNELIUS NEPOS—Twenty Lives**

Edited by J. E. Bars, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. Cloth, xiv + 316 pp. Maps and Illustrations. 90 cents net.

**THE MACMILLAN COMPANY**

64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK  
BOSTON CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO

**REVISED EDITION  
BARSS' WRITING LATIN**

Based on Lodge's "Vocabulary of High School Latin."

"A pronounced advance beyond the first edition, and will prove useful in many schools."—D. O. S. Lowell, Headmaster Roxbury Latin School. Cloth 144 Pages. 50 cents.

D. C. HEATH & CO., Publishers

231-241 West 39th St.,

New York

**A BEGINNER'S LATIN BOOK**

New in Plan—New in Method.

**Caesar's First Campaign**

By

William A. Jenner and Henry E. Wilson

Of the Boys' High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.

12mo., Cloth, \$1.00

**A FIRST-YEAR BOOK**

That meets the demand for modern methods of teaching.

That enables the student to begin his second-year work with the thirtieth chapter of Book I of the Gallic War.

That has a scientifically selected vocabulary, composed of those words that the pupil must know to read Caesar.

**D. APPLETON & COMPANY**

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

**UNDER THE NEW LATIN REQUIREMENTS**

adopted by the College Entrance Examination Board, April 16, 1910, schools shall select material not less in amount than the Gallic War, Books I-IV, from the Gallic and Civil Wars and Nepos's Lives. MATHER'S *CAESAR*—Episodes from the Gallic and Civil Wars (\$1.25) presents the most interesting and important parts of both works. Already adopted by Hotchkiss and other prominent secondary schools. LINDSAY'S *NEPOS*—Twenty-five Lives (\$1.10). For several years the standard edition. Unusually full and helpful notes, complete vocabulary and English-Latin exercises.

**AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY**

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

**THE COLLEGE SERIES**

**OF  
GREEK AND LATIN AUTHORS**

FOR  
FALL  
COURSES

This series offers the best texts—edited by eminent scholars—equipped with the most helpful apparatus for the student.

The list includes not only those Latin and Greek Classics most commonly read in American Colleges and Universities,

but also others suited to such use, but not previously issued in satisfactory editions.

Each volume includes an introduction, a commentary and other aids that set before the student a clear and scholarly criticism of the author studied.

**GINN AND COMPANY : PUBLISHERS**

70 Fifth Avenue

New York City